

REMARKS

Rejection of Claims 1-8, 14-21, and 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over US 6,157,673 (Cuccia) in view of US 6,181,706 (Anderson) and in further view of US 7,088,732 (Min)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-8, 14-21, and 27-28. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Cuccia, Anderson, and Min does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations as set forth in independent claims 1 and 14. For example, independent claims 1 and 14 recite “receiving a request for [collecting] program information ... [said] request ... include[ing] a first list of requested program information and a second list of requested program information different from the first list of requested program information” which is not taught or suggested in the combination of Cuccia, Anderson, and Min.

Min is directed to a technology for storing and comparing PIDs in a digital television system. The technology is implemented by storing portions of PIDs separately in PID storing units in groups of two or more bits. A PID of a current received packet is stored in storing units. A comparison of portions of the stored PID with the current received PID is performed. If all portions of the stored PID matches with the received current PID, a match signal is generated. See Min, Abstract.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement in item 8, page 3 of the Office Action dated April 30, 2008 that “Cuccia in combination with Anderson and Min discloses... receiving requests for collecting program information, said requests... including a first list of requested program information and a second list of requested program information different from the first list of requested program information.” The Office Action specifically refers to Min’s first portion of a current PID and a second portion of the current PID as describing or being analogous to

Applicant's first list of requested program information and second list of requested program information. However, Applicant's first list of requested program information includes for e.g., PID values and the second list of requested program information includes for e.g., Table ID, Table ID Extension, Version Number, Section Number etc. See Applicant's specification, page 9, lines 11-17. In contrast, according to Min on col. 4, lines 15-27, a PID having 13 bits in total is divided into two parts and processed separately. The first part of each PID is made up of 8 bits and a second part of each possible PID is made up of 5 bits. Thus, in Min, the parsed list in the transport stream is a single data unit namely, PIDs. Therefore, Min fails to disclose receiving a request having two separate lists of program information in the transport stream. Applicant's feature of "receiving a request ... including a first list of requested program information and a second list of requested program information different from the first list of requested program information" is missing in Min.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation apparent in the references to combine Min, Cuccia and Anderson. As mentioned above, Min is directed to a technology for storing and comparing PIDs in a digital television system. The technology is implemented by storing portions of PIDs separately in PID storing units in groups of two or more bits. Further, Min discloses receiving PIDs in the transport stream and segmenting each of the PIDs into two parts and storing the parts separately at the receiver. See Min, col. 4, lines 15-18. In contrast, Applicant's claimed invention discloses receiving two separate lists of program information in the transport stream. Thus, Applicant contends that the Office Action appears to rely solely on hindsight analysis, i.e., taking the disclosure of the pending application as a blueprint for piecing together the prior art.

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 14 are not obvious in view of the combination of Cuccia, Anderson, and Min, and therefore that the

rejection of claims 1 and 14 under 35 USC 103(a) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claims 1 and 14 now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 2-8, and 27 depend from and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Dependent claims 15-21, and 28 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claim 14. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 2-8, 15-21, and 27-28 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

To the extent an extension of time is needed for consideration of this response, Applicant hereby request such extension and, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account number 502117 for any fees associated therewith.

Dated: October 28, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Larry T. Cullen/
Larry T. Cullen
Registration No.: 44,489

Motorola Connected Home Solutions
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
(215) 323-1907